EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH BULLETIN: ERB

RECEIVED
JAN 23 1952
LIBRARY

DECEMBER 12, 1951

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Vol. XXX, No. 9

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH BULLETIN

(Entered in the United States Patent Office)

R. H. ECKELBERRY . . . . . *Editor*
J. MACLATCHY . . . . . *Assistant Editor*

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, FOR THE SCHOOLS OF OHIO. EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS OFFICES, ROOM 201, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, COLUMBUS, OHIO

CONTENTS

A Statement 225
By the Faculty, College of Education
The Ohio State University

The Era of the Educational Engineer 230
W. W. CHARTERS, *Emeritus, Bureau of Educational Research*

Editorial Comment 238

Readings 243
BOOKS TO READ—*Character and Citizenship Education: a Syllabus for Use in Teacher Training, An Introduction to Modern Psychology, Teaching Primary Reading, The Use of Mobile Cinema and Radio Vans in Fundamental Education, Analysis of the Study of Music Literature in Selected American Colleges, Bertrand Russell: a Sketch of His Life and Work*

Index of Volume XXX 247

THE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH BULLETIN is published monthly except during June, July, and August. Entered as Second-Class Matter, February 9, 1922, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Accepted for mailing at specified rates of postage provided for in Section 1103; Act of October 3, 1917, authorized February 21, 1922.

Educational Research Bulletin
DECEMBER 12, 1951
Vol. XXX, No. 9

A Statement

By the Faculty, College of Education, The Ohio State University

THE following statement was adopted by unanimous vote at a regular meeting of the faculty of the College of Education, The Ohio State University, on November 20, 1951. It sets forth certain convictions that are basic to the program of the College. While the discussion deals only with the teacher-education function, the same convictions underlie the entire College program. The statement is not a systematic or finished formulation of an educational philosophy. It is a deliberate affirmation of the faith on which the work of the College is based.

The statement grew out of the public controversy occasioned by the so-called "Rugg incident." In the course of the controversy the motives of members of the College faculty were impugned by a small minority of the press and a few individuals.[1] The statement is not an attempt to reply specifically to criticisms made by these detractors, but it does contradict them.

EDITOR

OUR public schools are free schools maintained by a free people. In totalitarian lands the situation is markedly different. There the groups in power expect to remain in power forever. They create schools, therefore, which will teach as truth the doctrines and opinions of those who control the government. In our country, no group is in power permanently, whether at the national, state, or local level. Grants of power are periodically reconsidered by the whole people and renewed or withdrawn at the people's pleasure.

[1] *See* "'The Rugg Incident,'" pp. 238–42, 246.

The fact that the public schools of America are free schools places upon them distinctive responsibilities. They were created by determined people experienced in the ways of freedom. Such people know that the battle for freedom is a continuing one. They know that freedom, difficult to gain, is easily lost. They want to be heard on all important issues. They should be heard; and, in America, they will be heard. But no group can properly insist that its doctrines or opinions be imposed upon the young in the American school.

The public schools of America belong not to boards of education, nor to teachers, nor to groups of influential citizens, but to all the people. No public school may withdraw from or neglect this relationship to the people who support it. School officials, teachers and parents, and the public generally, are partners in a common enterprise: to help each child develop into an independent person who can think for himself, reach his own judgments, choose his own goals, and play his proper part as an effective citizen.

This does not mean treating the child as if he were *already* such a person. The school must cultivate in him the basic knowledges and skills which every independent and effective citizen of a free land needs. He must learn to read; he must learn to write; he must learn to handle numbers and ideas of quantity. He must learn, also, to play fair, to be tolerant and generous, to strive up to his limit in making his individual gains, and to make them in such a way that others are not hurt through his efforts. These are fundamental learnings in our modern world.

An educational program that emphasizes these purposes has no place for an authoritarian blueprint, even though this be formulated by wise individuals or well-intentioned groups. The *working plans* of the good society are never the product of an individual or of a clique. No faculty of any school, and no single group in any community, possesses the wisdom, or the authority, or the responsibility to make such plans. The distinctive characteristic of a free world is the encouragement given to all to participate in the planning of the common life. This is no less true of educational planning than it is of all other planning that free men do.

So it is that our public schools are free from external and arbitrary authority. Yet such freedom is fruitless if the schools do not work zealously to aid the student in developing an

internal authority. Our students have learned to prize certain ways of behaving and certain attitudes toward life. In this respect they reflect their culture adequately. But education would fall short of its obligations were it to fail to help the individual view his past learnings thoughtfully. For this reason the public schools should guide each individual child in examining his own habits and attitudes, always as a normal accompaniment of his continuing learning. Naturally, such self-examination will occur at the level of the child's development. It will go forward in ways that encourage inquiry into the widest possible range of relevant fact and knowledge. This is but to say, as the American heritage has always contended, that the citizen is dedicated to the beliefs by which free men live and is capable of supporting them by hard and vigorous thinking. This is the one way—and it is the democratic way—in which internal authority may be created and nourished.

Each of us, as he develops, grows into habit and attitude that later life will challenge. The individual cannot be protected against change and challenge; nor should he be. His strength is to be gained in meeting challenge, in dealing with change, in handling controversy on a basis of fact. In no other way can he escape the entangling coils of opinion and bias. As his knowledge is extended, what he already knows will be required to stand up to the test of new knowledge.

The school seeks to give the individual courage as he strikes out on his independent course of building his own guiding beliefs into a consistent and satisfying outlook on life. This is necessarily his personal domain. The school can help him make it one that he understands, and one of which he is proud. It can show him how to distinguish fact from opinion and to transform limited and rigid habits into flexible instruments that lead to intelligent behavior. What the school cannot and must not do is to predetermine the *content* of an *individual student's* point of view. This is indoctrination, pure and simple. Deliberate indoctrination of a captive audience is the cardinal sin against the free mind.

THE College of Education builds its programs in terms of these beliefs. This program is admittedly imperfect. None the less, its students get an orientation in methods of teaching and in what is known about human growth and development. They also consider the work of the school in

relationship to the great issues of the day. These great social issues, however, are those over which friends and neighbors disagree. They lead to normal disagreements, also, within the faculty of the College of Education. And since there are differences among us, we would find it intolerable to inflict or impose our several private opinions upon our students. Even if each tried and were successful, no single point of view would prevail, since our faculty holds divergent social and economic views just as do the parents of our students. Even to attempt this kind of indoctrination would destroy the unity of our faculty, a unity which is the result of working and living together in a spirit that has helped us learn to respect our differences.

There are areas of teaching, however, where tested conclusions are available. We have nailed down many sound ideas about the nature of learning, the characteristics of children and adolescents, how to teach reading, or science, or foreign languages. Even here, since we are dealing with unique individuals, we cannot impose any hard-and-fast rules which will be useful at all times and in all circumstances. But we are obligated, where we have professional competence, to acquaint our students with what is known and how we have come to know it.

The education of our students is a co-operative task. They have come to us, for the most part, from Ohio families, from Ohio high schools. We take them where they are, with due regard for their ideas and ideals. The College of Education, however, can provide only a part of their educational program. Those who are to educate others must themselves be educated, and our College does not have within itself all of the resources which our students need for their own general education. Much of their work, their education in science, languages, philosophy, history, economics, sociology, and so forth, must be secured through other divisions of the University. In addition, the public schools and other community agencies are laboratories in which our students explore the significance of what they learn on the campus and develop further the skills and understandings they will use later as they become responsible teachers.

It is within these situations of co-operation that we secure our goals, our purposes. Just as we have faith in the ability of our students to think, we have faith in the thinking ability of their parents, of all those who support our schools, and of all who have direct responsibilities for public education. We

believe that the broad goals and direction of our public schools must continuously be hammered out on the anvil of discussion, both in the community at large and in the College of Education.

It is not easy to foster such shared thinking, or to gain commonly held conclusions. And it is certainly true that we fall short of this ideal goal. It is fair, however, to claim a measure of success. We have learned how to work, on and off campus, in a co-operative way and, in this process, we have created a college which is distinctively a humane institution. The primary concern of the College is to create a learning and teaching situation in which students and faculty share the experience of gaining insight into purposes and ideas that are basic to the maintenance of a free world. Its fundamental interest is to nurture respect for human difference and for the fully humane personality.

How, then, is the nature of the final product, the graduate of the College of Education of The Ohio State University, to be judged? He must be judged critically, and is continuously so judged, by five groups of persons. These are: first, our own staff, who spend hundreds of hours annually trying to improve our teaching and curriculum; second, the students themselves, who are given many opportunities on committees, in classes, and as individuals to judge critically the kind of education they are getting; third, parents and other citizens, who are deeply and properly concerned about the education of children; fourth, school boards and administrators, who employ our graduates; and fifth, members of the teaching profession, who, with us, are endeavoring to create the best possible education for all the children of all the people.

As we go forward with our task, we do not ask to be shielded from public criticism. We ask only that our strengths and shortcomings be studied carefully. This is a normal expectation among friends and neighbors. To disagree thoughtfully is never an unfriendly act. Public education will not suffer in an atmosphere of honest criticism, for those who create this atmosphere are the friends of the schools. They are, in fact, participants in the task of improving educational opportunities for the youth of America. The real enemies of the public schools are those who do not love children, who do not appreciate democracy, and who do not prize public discussion of public issues.

Every person in Ohio has a stake in The Ohio State Uni-

versity, and in the quality of its teaching and of its faculty. Faculty members can meet their obligation only as they are free to inquire into the problems of their respective fields and make available what study reveals. This is not a plea for special privilege. It is rather a recognition of the serious responsibility of the teaching profession. The student is the critical factor in this consideration. It is his opportunity to learn which must at all costs be protected. Those of us in the College of Education have bet our future, along with others, on this conception of a university. We have done what we could to increase the usefulness of our College and its prestige in Ohio, in the United States, and abroad. In the years that lie ahead it is our hope that all concerned may learn to co-operate in the building of a great university, in a great state, in a great nation.

The Era of the Educational Engineer

By W. W. CHARTERS

THE last half-century has been an enormously exciting period in education. It opened with the *tabula rasa* concept on control of the educative processes. The child was considered a somewhat passive learner, with a mind like a clean slate upon which the teacher etched a design for living. To do this he used the three R's and certain other well-outlined subjects. The child was expected to accept prescribed facts, develop simple fundamental habits, and acquire the accepted values of society. Methods of instruction were believed to be so easily acquired that any intelligent or conscientious person who had himself studied the subjects in school could teach them. Instruction was a simple process in those days.

It is true that philosophers like Plato and Spencer had formulated objectives of education, and educators like Comenius, Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Herbart had explored the techniques of instruction, but their influence was felt in the theory rather than in the practice of the classrooms of this country.

With the beginning of the present century a new era was born. The age of the idea man opened quietly. Forty years before, Charles Darwin had propounded the theory of evolu-

tion, with its emphasis upon the interrelation of function and structure. By 1900 it began to influence educational theory. It has taken four decades for evolutionary concepts to seep from biology through philosophy, ethics, and sociology to education as particularly formulated by Dewey. At the beginning of the century the universities turned their belated attention to the field of education. They established colleges of education, and by this act high graduate scholarship was demanded for the first time of faculties in education. These scholars were thrown into intimate contact with scholars in other disciplines and a process of cross-fertilization began. Educators thirstily absorbed ideas from philosophy, psychology, public administration, statistics, sociology, and experimental and social sciences, and applied them to their field while adding new ideas of their own.

These were thrilling days for educators. Thorndike in 1902 gave them confidence when he laid low the concept of transfer of training which had been the barricade of the conservatives who were indifferent to change. The use of statistical techniques, beginning around 1910, profoundly stimulated the measurement of objectives. I well remember the impact of the first objective arithmetic test. We asked, "Have you heard of that new arithmetic test by Courtis?" A few weeks later, "Have you used the test?" The development of the Binet-Simon tests for American use around 1915 gave a base for the exploration of individual differences. And over all, the philosophy of Dewey, who electrified the educational world by the dictum, "The school is not a preparation for life; it is life," exerted an all-pervasive influence upon the invention of ideas. In a rapidly increasing spread of professional journals some new idea was likely to appear in any issue. As each new concept appeared, the educational world, on pioneering bent, would wonder, "What does that idea mean for education?" and enjoy the game of thinking about its application.

Now after a half-century we are able to review the activity of the years in the world of emerging ideas. The *Dictionary of Education* contains a vocabulary of twenty thousand words, perhaps 90 per cent of which have been invented by the educators, borrowed from other disciplines, or handed down from the history of education and given new meanings. Statistically, this implies 400 new terms a year, or one a day, over

the half-century. The family of ideas around the activity concept, new in 1900, now numbers sixty-one in the *Dictionary of Education,* including a variety of activities—*extra-curricular, autogenetic, philogenetic, self-testing, co-operative,* and *creative*—the *activity plan,* and the *activity unit.* The concept of the individual is a coterie of 30 subsidiary ideas. The social concept includes 154 specific meanings, and tests take 244 detailed forms. Obviously, the mere verbal mastery of ideas new to education is a colossal task, beyond the capacity of many individuals in the field. And the number is continuing to grow. I note that a recent vigorous entrant, called *group dynamics,* does not appear in the *Dictionary of Education,* which was published only six years ago. All readers will agree with me that the field of education is abundantly supplied with ideas, concepts, terms, and vocabulary.

The mastery of ideas as an intellectual activity is important, but it does not hold priority in the educative process. That position must be given to changes in the behavior of the child. The social function of education, for which it is supported by society and the state, is to nurture the young so that they become good citizens with rich personal lives. The efficiency of the profession is measured not by its ideas but by how well they operate in practice in performing this service. The child is the thing; ideas are tools. What effect the twenty thousand ideas of the educator have upon forty million children at the hands of one million teachers in the schools of the nation, urban, suburban, and rural, is a matter of grave concern, particularly to the profession of education.

THE region of professional effort which lies between the land of ideas and the centers of pedogogical industry where children are developed is the domain of educational engineering. The house flag displays the question, "How?" Professional energies are there devoted to an intelligent and anxious study to discover how ideas can be used by the teachers and their children. The problems encountered in educational engineering are baffling because the uses to which ideas may be put are complicated by the complexity of human psychology and social values to a degree not encountered in physical engineering. It is easier to make an atom bomb than to make a superior citizen. But the task is there to be performed.

Unfortunately, too many of the leaders in education in the last half-century have been largely engrossed with ideas on the plane of theory and have been satisfied to apply them only in localized situations. They have the common tendency of esoterics to depreciate the status of methods of performance. Methods belong to the classroom operator, they think. They say that attention to methods has a tendency to destroy the creative spirit of education and make teaching mechanical. Their slogan is, Present the idea to the teacher and he will work out the methods of application for himself. When educators foregather at the table, the educational engineer is seated below the salt.

Increasingly, as the years progress, however, educators are experimenting in their situations and are inventing methods of applying ideas to meet the problems they face. The staffs of hundreds of school systems across the land labor diligently to discover new techniques. State systems upon occasion make a frontal attack upon problems of wide application. National organizations, notably the National Education Association and the American Association of School Superintendents, are producing reports which embody applications in programs of action. A dramatic survey of the professional energy lavished upon the engineering aspect of education is provided by an examination of the *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, in which numerous investigations of methods of operation in educative processes are described in one and a half-million words. Colleges here and there have been concentrating for decades upon the exploration of new ideas.

As one surveys the widespread interest, the broad range of activities, now apparent across the nation, he does not need to be a visionary to detect the emergence of an engineering era in education. I shall define educational engineering by answering the question, Who is the educational engineer? Anyone who intelligently builds efficient methods of performance is an educational engineer. Intelligent building means defining objectives, planning, building, operating, and measuring efficiency.[1]

Changes in education during the past half-century have been many. I have the temerity to forecast the probable trends of future changes. I predict a change of emphasis in the next

[1] Charters, W. W. "Is There a Field of Educational Engineering?" EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH BULLETIN, XXIV (February 14, 1945), pp. 29–37, 56.

half-century in the field of education. The shift will be from the exploration of educational ideas and concepts to the development of techniques for putting them into practice. The five methods used by the educational engineer will continue to be used. The engineer will identify the idea to be worked upon, analyze it, and select promising hypotheses concerning its practical uses. He will experimentally play with plans for building a structure that will use the full value of the idea. He will build the unit—a curricular unit, an operational technique, an instructional method. He will operate the tool and try it out in practice. He will test the results to measure the efficiency and practicality of what he has constructed. These engineering methods will be perfected in the light of experience and practice, and a growing body of educational-engineering techniques will develop over the decades.

EVALUATION and measurement will be enormously advanced. Indeed, they must be perfected in range and efficiency because their limitations now retard experimentation. One excuse for the extravagant claims often made for a new idea in education is the lack of adequate instruments to measure the validity of the claim. Because measures are not available, the claim can be neither substantiated nor refuted; an enthusiastic proponent may soar in the speculative ether.

In 1951 it is possible to measure growth in information within the limits of paper-and-pencil techniques. Verbal tests for growth in attitudes, ideals, appreciation of values, traits, and emotional control have appeared, but they are narrow in range and have doubtful validity. Objective measures of behavior are practically nonexistent. That is to say, we do not yet know how to measure the effect of ideas upon the individual as he lives from day to day.

The measurement lag is not due to lack of interest on the part of the specialists. Rather it is due to the conditions under which they work. Measurement of physical phenomena is easy; measurement of human behavior is complicated. The materials of the physical engineer are static—a bar of steel is the same this year as next. The material with which the educator works —the child—is constantly changing. The sciences of human behavior have not yet developed a constancy in measurement remotely approaching that of physical phenomena. Some day

psychological measurement may be as accurate as physical measurement. The labor will be arduous, but, because the experimenters are enthusiastic and capable, tremendous advances can confidently be looked for in the next half-century.

I foresee a steadily increasing number of local centers of educational experimentation. Although professional magazines now contain an encouraging output of reports of investigations by individuals, committees, school systems, and colleges, these reports represent only a small fraction of the studies that are being carried on. Educators are more conscious of their problems today than they have ever been before. In the future we may expect substantial increases in the amount of research and in the number of centers where investigations are in progress.

THERE are, of course, different levels of expertness among the workers. The well-trained educational engineer assembles pertinent facts wherever found and uses the best techniques in solving his problems of construction. The less expert worker does not have background knowledge equal to that of the expert and has not perfected his skills of construction, but he loves to build for greater efficiency and so is included in the craft. In the nation's schools the number of amateur educational engineers is encouragingly large.

To improve the training of these amateurs and their successors will be an important objective. The number of courses of high quality devoted to experimentation in methods and techniques will undoubtedly increase. In graduate schools of education the courses dealing with research techniques will be expanded to include the techniques of operational research. Research laboratories will expand their geographical areas to include the schools of the nations, because good engineering techniques demand that methods developed in the laboratory be tried out in practice before their validity is demonstrated and prior to their release for general use. Field research will be enormously expanded by schools of education. Graduate instructors who now devote their energies to introducing their students to ideas, points of view, and objectives will rightly continue to do so, but their interest in teaching methods of making the ideas work will increase. A substantial number of men on the faculties will devote the major part of their energies and interest to building programs and inventing new tech-

niques. The situation will demand concentration of effort upon processing the wealth of good ideas so as to show how they can be used with children in the schools of the nation. Social logic demands it. Current interest makes it probable.

In my view of the future, I foresee improvement in the agencies of collecting and distributing the reports of investigations. Operational research is amorphous today. A thousand studies are carried on, tested, and found useful in local centers. Ten are reported; 990 are unknown except to the workers. Systematic and efficient procedures for collection and distribution will be developed in the future. Interested in collection will be city systems, state systems, graduate-research centers, and the society of educational engineers (when it is founded). These agencies will devise a plan by which useful techniques of operation may be assembled and published. The form will be simple, the information terse, and the suggestions practical. Details of operation will be worked out in the light of experience, and the ultimate goal of communication will be achieved. Proved techniques established by anybody will be available to everybody.

As I view the over-all picture I am impressed by a fundamental fact. The work of educating children is in the hands of teachers. An educational idea, however promising, is useful in the educative process only when the teacher uses it successfully with children. Most teachers do not invent new techniques. They use the ones they are told about. This may be unfortunate but it is true in teaching, as in society at large. Therefore, it is necessary to divide and subdivide methods of application into more and more detail until they are ready for use. Some critics say this leads to formalism in teaching. They must agree, however, that even though the teacher is familiar with all the methods that have been invented, he will need his own creative talents to use them at the right time when he faces the pupils in his classroom.

Obviously the builder of techniques must patiently and persistently perfect his methods until they reach the goal of practice. The efforts of a lifetime can be wasted if he does not go all the way. The Patent Office in Washington provides many examples of lives devoted to invention whose products have never been used: the inventor may have lived an exciting

life, but his influence upon society is negligible. His product is not used. Similarly, thought given to educational inventions will be useless unless they lead to the development of techniques which can be effectively used with the child by the teacher.

Second, I predict concerted national action in the field of educational engineering. The task of building an efficient body of methods in usable form cannot be left to individual initiative. The number of investigators devoted to special areas will increase. A greater number of research workers will concentrate upon definite fields—spelling, reading, social problems, supervision—for a lifetime. As educational engineers, they will study the fundamental problems and utilize relevant ideas from allied disciplines. A good beginning has been made. The administrators of city and state systems will more frequently employ staff members who will investigate ways of improving instruction and administration in the local situation. These persons will be more interested in improving the methods of operation than in compiling statistical analyses.

The natural center for a national attack is the Office of Education. The Federal Government has established precedents in its agricultural experiment stations and in the huge appropriations granted to the Department of Defense for programs of investigation. These precedents can be improved upon but they are established and can be followed in the educational field. The primary task of a national agency is obviously the collection and distribution of approved methods of operation. The size of the project is gigantic. The problems of selection are perplexing. The number of areas to be covered runs into scores. Concurrently with primary collection and distribution, extensive operational research will increase and its procedures will be refined. These, as found in practice in areas other than education, will be the special and guiding responsibility of graduate schools and bureaus of educational research.

Third, I predict a rapidly growing increase of money for educational research. Logic demands it. Funds are now being poured into physical and military research by the billions. Yet insistently we are told, and ourselves believe, that the current critical need in American life is human engineering. The nation needs to concentrate upon an understanding of what we call democracy, assemble methods of performance, and induce our

[*Continued on page 246*]

EDITORIAL COMMENT

The "Rugg Incident"[1]

THE current controversy at Ohio State University involves important issues with respect to academic freedom and faculty responsibility. . . .

In order to understand the controversy, it is necessary to know how it developed. Each summer for several years the Boyd H. Bode Conference has been held under the auspices of the Department of Education of the University. This conference is named in honor of the distinguished educator who served at the University from 1921 until his retirement in 1944; it deals with social and philosophical questions as they bear on education. For the past two or three years, the Representative Assembly of Graduate Students in Education has taken responsibility for planning and conducting the conference.

Last spring, from among several persons suggested as speakers, the students expressed a strong preference for Harold O. Rugg, emeritus professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University. After consultation with Mr. Hullfish, adviser, and Dean Cottrell of the College of Education, they invited Mr. Rugg. On July 10 he served as principal speaker at the conference.

Violent criticism of Mr. Rugg and of those responsible for inviting him broke out immediately in two Columbus newspapers which are under the same control. Rugg was denounced as a discredited doctrinaire advocate of socialism, a left-wing propagandist. There was little criticism of what he said at the conference; nearly all of it was directed at his textbooks and his utterances in previous years. President Bevis' statement that an invitation to Rugg did not necessarily imply agreement with his views did little or nothing to lessen the criticism. In editorials and letters there were calls for an investigation of the circumstances under which Rugg had been invited and of subversive views on the part of faculty members. The Governor requested the Board of Trustees to look into the matter.

[1] Reprinted from an editorial, "Academic Freedom at Ohio State University," *Journal of Higher Education*, XXII (December, 1951), pp. 493–98.

At its meeting on September 4, the Board of Trustees issued the following press release:

> The Board of Trustees finds that the invitation extended to Dr. Harold O. Rugg was not in accord with the traditions and objectives of Ohio State University, and such action is hereby condemned.
>
> In order to avoid recurrence of such an unfortunate incident the Board of Trustees has adopted a rule requiring that all speakers appearing on the campus shall be cleared through the President's Office.
>
> The function of the University is teaching, not indoctrination. The University must not be used as an agency of unAmerican propaganda. Every effort will be made to carry out these purposes.

The rule referred to in the press release actually covers not only speakers on the campus, but all speakers appearing under University auspices. It specifies

> That the President shall establish procedures:
>
> A. Under which all proposed invitations to speakers appearing on the University campus or under University auspices shall be submitted to his office for clearance ten days prior to the extension of the actual invitation by the individual, department or college concerned.

During September the University was not in session and hence no formal action by faculty groups was feasible. The matter was, however, the subject of many conversations among faculty members. Almost without exception, these members were alarmed by the Board's action; they believed it to be not merely a threat to, but an actual violation of, academic freedom. The matter continued to be discussed acrimoniously in the press. Editorials and letters criticizing University "left-wingers" and defending the Board's action continued to appear in the two papers that had started the discussion. Other newspapers in, and outside, the state took up the fight; a majority of these, including the third paper in Columbus, opposed the Board's action.

Early in October, it was learned that permission to speak on the campus had been denied to Cecil E. Hinshaw, a Quaker pacifist, and former president of William Penn College. Permission to have Mr. Hinshaw as a speaker had been requested by the campus chapter of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. No reason was given for the denial. No other person is publicly known to have been rejected as a speaker.

On October 2, the faculty of the College of Education met at the call of its Planning Committee to consider the action of

the Board. At this meeting the faculty unanimously passed a resolution stating that it "views the Board's action with gravest concern as being apparently an infringement of the principles of faculty responsibility and of freedom of learning and teaching which have so long prevailed here." The resolution requested the Conference Committee of the Teaching Staff and the Faculty Council to "take immediate steps looking to the reconsideration of the Board's action to the end that academic freedom be preserved and advanced in this University."

The next day the Conference Committee of the Teaching Staff, which is an unofficial committee elected by the teaching staff of the University to represent it in dealing with matters affecting the quality of the educational program or involving the rights and responsibilities of the teaching staff, unanimously endorsed the resolution passed by the faculty of the College of Education. It also transmitted to the Faculty Council its own resolution asking for a reconsideration of the Board's action. The Faculty Council, which is the official legislative body representing the faculty of the University, on October 9 approved these resolutions and ordered them transmitted to the Board of Trustees.

At its meeting on October 15 the Board of Trustees expressed "full confidence in the loyalty and high purpose of the President, faculty, students, and alumni," but unanimously reaffirmed its previous action. In explanation, it said:

> As Trustees of the Ohio State University, we encourage the fullest academic freedom consistent with national security. The facilities of the University will not be made available to known Communists or other groups who seek to undermine the basic liberties of America.
>
> We recognize no inalienable right to any freedom which has for its purpose the destruction of our government. . . .

The Board did, however, propose that it meet with a committee of the Faculty Council to discuss the Council's resolutions. It also approved the suggestion that a committee of deans be appointed to advise the President "in the administration of the problems involved."

Meanwhile, another action of the Board became known. By letter dated October 10, the President notified the deans that the resolution of the Board on September 4 had included a second part. This directed the President to establish

procedures

. . . under which all questionnaires prepared by an individual employed by the University in a department or college thereof and directed to students, staff, faculty or the public shall be submitted to his office for clearance prior to issuance.

This information was transmitted promptly by the deans to members of the faculty. Not only had there been no previous announcement of this action taken more than five weeks earlier, but there had been no intimation that any such action had even been considered.

On October 16 the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors discussed the Board's action with the President and instructed its Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure to study the matter further and report to a later meeting of the chapter. On October 19 the Faculty Council elected a committee to meet with the Board.

On October 26 this committee met with the Board. At the conclusion of the meeting the chairman of the Board announced that progress had been made in reducing the area of misunderstanding and that additional meetings would be held.

Meanwhile, there . . . [were] increasing protests against the Board's action by persons and agencies representing educational, labor, religious, and other groups. The New York *Times* . . . carried four highly critical articles by its education editor, and an editorial.[2] On the campus, the Student Senate and the University Religious Council . . . expressed their disapproval. A number of scholarly and professional organizations . . . considered cancellation of their plans to meet on the campus if they have to subject their speakers to screening.

. . . . . .

On November 7 the President announced certain "interpretations" of the speaker-screening rule which amount to a substantial modification of it. Under these "interpretations" a faculty member may, without prior clearance, invite speakers to his own classes; the heads of the recognized religious foundations serving the students of the University may speak on the campus at any time; recognized off-campus organizations may hold meetings on the campus without submitting the names of their speakers for clearance.

[2] October 26, 27, 28 and 29.

On the same day that this modification was announced, the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors met to consider the report of its Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. At this meeting several resolutions were adopted. The first directed that a letter be sent to the President for transmission to the Board, explaining the Chapter's opposition to the speaker-screening and questionnaire rules. Other resolutions expressed confidence in the Faculty Council committee that was meeting with the Board, directed the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure to continue its study of the matter, and ordered the committee to consider and report on means for improving communication and consultation between the Board and the faculty. The final resolution took note of the relaxation of the speaker-screening rule provided by the newly announced "interpretations," but affirmed the conviction that these did not meet the fundamental objections that the faculty had urged against the rules.

On November 10 the Graduate Council of the University passed two resolutions; one opposed on principle the Trustees' rules, and the other directed a committee to prepare a detailed statement of ways in which the rules were affecting graduate education and research.

On November 11 the National Council of the American Association of University Professors, meeting in Chicago, adopted a resolution declaring that "the Trustees' action is subversive of the functions of a free university in a free society," and urging the Trustees to "recognize their responsibility to maintain an atmosphere of freedom at the University." On the same day, it was reported that the Franklin County Council of the American Legion, representing twenty-seven posts, had unanimously passed a resolution commending the Trustees for their action.

At its meeting on November 12 the Board of Trustees heard a presentation of a liberalized campus-speaker policy proposed by the Student Senate Lobby Committee, but took no action on it. The Board did, however, approve the "interpretations" of the speaker-screening rule previously announced by the President and approved modification of the questionnaire-screening rule so as to require screening by the department involved rather than by the President's Office.

[*Continued on page 246*]

READINGS

Books to Read

JONES, VERNON. *Character and Citizenship Education: a Syllabus for Use in Teacher Training.* Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1950. ix+149 pp.

Responsibility for the content of this syllabus is assumed by the author alone, although the publication grows directly out of a workshop held at Clark University in 1949, sponsored by the Palmer Foundation. The author states that "the syllabus has been prepared with the needs of practicing teachers, graduate students in Education, and seniors in teacher-training institutions primarily in mind" (page iv).

Organized strictly as a syllabus, with lists of problems, readings, and suggestions for study and discussion for each of the eighteen units, the book suffers from all the limitations of such a manual. The reader is at once plagued by queries such as: Who will use this booklet? How many colleges offer courses in character and citizenship education? Will the average teacher profit from reading these fragmented units? To use this manual with real success, a college teacher needs extensive experience, high scholarship, and a good philosophical and psychological background. Such a teacher is not apt to need or want any syllabus but his own.

A real contribution is made in the distinctions drawn between direct and indirect instruction from the point of view both of teachers and of pupils, as well as in clarifying the goal of education for understanding versus that of improved conduct and attitudes. The heart of a syllabus is its bibliography, but this one, comprehensive and excellent as it is, emphasizes the writings of two and three decades ago and fails to include several recent developments. Why in 1950 omit consideration of the use of movies except in sex education, television as an educational problem, and the importance of using group dynamics, rôle-playing, non-directive group discussion, and pupil self-evaluation as promising teaching procedures?

Finally, a brief monograph of the best suggested theory, practices, and writings in character and citizenship education would more likely have far greater effect on instruction than a syllabus for a course which is still so rare.

L. O. ANDREWS

ZANGWELL, O. L. *An Introduction to Modern Psychology.* New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1950. xii+227 pp.

The author of this compact little book attempts to outline modern empirical psychology as lying within the broad framework of the biological sciences. In the first chapter, one obtains a brief glimpse of the origin and progress of psychology. The next two chapters survey experimental psychology. The author effectively promotes understanding of the sensory process in Chapter II. Such material as sensory adaptation, perceptual constancies, and induced movements is concisely, authoritatively discussed. In

Chapter III, material pertaining to learning and intellect is presented. Although such concepts as unconscious incubation, inborn response, and unconscious mentation are discussed in context, a glossary of terms would have aided materially.

Perhaps Chapter VI, "Intelligence and Mental Measurement," is most controversial and least satisfactory. The whole chapter itself is in the nature of a curt summary. There is room for objections to the author's generalizations pertaining to the development of thinking in children. The treatment of the brief presentation of factor analysis is pessimistic and of dubious value in a book such as this.

Contemporary status and future implications are adequately discussed. The author believes that psychology can profit from technological application. However, as a pure science it must pursue its aim of understanding human behavior. "As in every science the extent to which it achieves its aim in the disinterested pursuit of knowledge is the ultimate criterion of its value to human society" (page 220). The remaining chapters deal with psychoanalysis, problems of personality, and physiological psychology.

On the whole, although the book is well written, an accurate, full treatment is sacrificed to brevity. Although this book is informative, one wonders if a meaningful presentation of empirical psychology can be adequate in such a brief, introductive survey.

BERNARD HANES

DOLCH, EDWARD WILLIAM. *Teaching Primary Reading.* Champaign, Illinois: Garrard Press, 1950. vii+458 pp.

This revision of a book by the same title published in 1941 contains three chapters which are entirely new. These deal with child development, basal readers, and remedial reading. The remaining chapters follow the first edition except for a few minor changes and additions. After briefly recognizing the importance of child development, the author proceeds with a discussion of reading instruction in the primary grades. The use of the basal reader is reviewed, with suggestions for adapting it in a variety of situations to serve different needs. The new chapter on remedial reading recognizes, and points out to teachers, the possible causes of reading difficulties and the problems that arise in working with children who are slow in developing the necessary readiness for reading.

Teachers in the first three grades will find many of their perennial problems discussed and a number of definite suggestions offered. The utilization of everyday experiences, needs, and desires of children, as suggested in the chapter entitled "Child Development First," seems to need further amplification. More emphasis on reading as an integral part of the total school program would be desirable.

ESTHER SCHATZ

UNESCO. *The Use of Mobile Cinema and Radio Vans in Fundamental Education.* New York: Columbia University, 1949. 192 pp.

A mobile cinema or radio van is simply a specially constructed truck containing audio-visual equipment: films, filmstrips, slides, projectors, radio receiving sets, aerials, records, record players, and electrical generating apparatus.

The book reviews the work mobile vans have done for education in past decades in Canada, the U.S.S.R., and the British Colonies. It is easy to see why the mobile vans are particularly useful for Unesco's program in fundamental education. The vans can go into areas which are without electricity, theaters, schools, or radio stations, so they have high value for fundamental education in the world's undeveloped areas.

This book carefully surveys the world-wide use of mobile vans. Successful teaching techniques, obstacles to the effective use of the vans, and areas of needed research into the problems encountered are all discussed in detail. There is, for the specialist interested in such vans, a whole section of photographs and illustrations of different kinds of vans, their construction specifications, and necessary equipment. Indeed, for the specialist, just about all the technical information now available seems to be between the covers of this little handbook.

For the rest of us, this survey is an heroic tale, really, of pioneers in education struggling to relieve the sickness of a world in which more than half the citizens are illiterate, diseased, and impoverished.

HUBERT MOREHEAD

KAHO, ELIZABETH E. *Analysis of the Study of Music Literature in Selected American Colleges.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950. x+74 pp. (Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 971).

This book is of special interest to college teachers of music literature since it gives an account of the amount of music literature recommended and taught, and its classification as to period and category; the courses in which this music literature was presented; the methods by which this music literature was presented.

The results of the investigation are carefully summarized in a concluding chapter which will cause any college teacher to reconsider content and methods in the teaching of music literature. The findings are well worth earnest consideration.

JOSEPH A. LEEDER

LEGGETT, H. W. *Bertrand Russell: a Sketch of His Life and Work.* New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1950. 78 pp.

To my way of thinking, Bertrand Russell is a person who cannot be discussed, even sketchily, in seventy-eight pages. The author may have thought he could pique the reader's curiosity enough so that he would read more of Russell's life and works, but I feel that he has failed even in this.

I, personally, found it very hard to follow his train of thought because of the unrelated material which composes the six chapters. To me it was incoherent and badly written. The pictures are interesting, but there are not enough of them to warrant a binder's subtitle, "Pictorial biography."

LOUISE EDMONDSON

The Era of the Educational Engineer

[*Continued from page 237*]

citizens to use them. This has been and is the major responsibility of the schools.

Therefore, as we grow sensitive to the situation, money will be provided in very substantial sums to carry on the work of educational engineering. A nation that started at scratch, that built a program and won a war because it was fighting for its way of life, will provide funds to build a program to win its peaceful war for better living.

These activities which probably, if not certainly, will be carried on in an expanding future, will be aided by psychology and sociology, the supporting interest of the public, and the active interest of the profession. Men of engineering temperament, who wholeheartedly believe that construction of efficient programs, methods, and techniques has professional priority, may well congregate and organize themselves into an enthusiastic and potent group to strengthen the interest of the profession in these matters, to encourage each other, and to propose programs of action. The need is urgent. The time is favorable.

[Vol. XXX, No. 9]

The "Rugg Incident"

[*Continued from page 242*]

In a straw vote conducted by the Student Senate on November 15, students of the University voted against the speaker-screening rule by 2,986 to 637. On November 16 the second meeting of the Faculty Council committee and the Board was held. At the conclusion of the meeting it was announced that definite progress had been made, and that another meeting would be held. Hope was expressed that a solution would be worked out at the next meeting.

Meanwhile, three speakers who had been cleared by the President's Office have declined to speak on the campus because of the "gag-rule." Two organizations—the Midwest Psychological Association and the art section of the Ohio Education Association—are to meet in other cities instead of in Columbus.

R. H. E.

Index of Volume XXX

(E) Editorial

(R) Review

Alexander, Carter, and Burke, Arvid J., *How to Locate Educational Information and Data* (R), (Ruth E. Seeger), 49

Anderson, Earl W., and Eliassen, R. H., Investigations in Teacher Supply and Demand Reported in 1950, 97–104, 112

Aubert, Louis F.; Diebold, William; Zvegintzov, Michael, *et al.*, *Control of Germany* (R), (Walter L. Dorn), 24–25

Babbitt, Adeline Emily, *A Program for Children 18 to 72 Months in the Hawaiian Situation* (R), (Amalie K. Nelson), 80–81

Bender, Richard N., *A Philosophy of Life* (R), (Albert E. Avey), 50

Berenda, Ruth W., *The Influence of the Group on the Judgments of Children* (R), (Robert E. Hubbard), 109

Bidwell, Percy W.; Hawtrey, R. G.; Lychowski, Tadeus Z.; and van Helmont, J., *Germany's Contribution to European Economic Life* (R), (Walter L. Dorn, 24–25

Bjorset, Brynjolf, *Man and This Mysterious Universe* (R), (Albert E. Avey), 49–50

Bloom, Benjamin S., and Broder, Lois J., *Problem-solving Processes of College Students* (R), (F. P. Robinson), 54–55

Bogue, Jesse Parker, *The Community College* (R), (Earl W. Anderson), 76–77

Brameld, Theodore, *Ends and Means in Education* (R), (Robert E. Jewett), 51–52

Bridgman, Percy W., *Reflections of a Physicist* (R), (John S. Richardson), 78–79

Broder, Lois J., and Bloom, Benjamin S., *Problem-solving Processes of College Students* (R), (F. P. Robinson), 54–55

Burke, Arvid J., and Alexander, Carter, *How to Locate Educational Information and Data* (R), (Ruth E. Seeger), 49

Burnett, Collins W., Leadership on the College Campus, 34–41

Burnett, Collins W., Validating Campus Leadership, 67–73, 84

Burr, James B.; Harding, Lowry W.; and Jacobs, Leland B., *Student Teaching in the Elementary School* (R), (Charles W. Young), 50–51

Butts, R. Freeman, *The American Tradition in Religion and Education* (R), (Clarke L. Foster), 134–35

Cardwell, Jesse F., and Fink, T. Ross, *A Report to the President of George Peabody College for Teachers on the Student-Teaching Program* (R), (William Logan), 83

Certain Procedures Used in the Oregon School Legislative Program, T. C. Holy, 125–29

Charters, W. W., The Era of the Educational Engineer, 230–37, 246

Child Welfare 1950, Celia S. Deschin, 1–12

Cochran, Emory E., *The Experimental Didactics of Ernst Otto* (R), (Albert E. Avey), 78

Cocking, Walter D., The School Survey and Its Social Implications, 169–79, 196

Cole, Luella, *A History of Education* (R), (Lloyd P. Williams), 110–11

College of Education, The Ohio State University, Faculty of, A Statement, 225–30

College of Education Work Conference, The, Josephine H. MacLatchy, 129–32, 139–40

Crewson, Walter S., A School Survey Appraised by the Superintendent, 190–94

Cronkhite, Bernice Brown, editor, *A Handbook for College Teachers* (R), (Earl W. Anderson), 109–10

Crow, Alice, and Crow, Lester D., *An Introduction to Guidance* (R), (Mary J. Drucker), 166

Crow, Lester D., and Crow, Alice, *An Introduction to Guidance* (R), (Mary J. Drucker), 166

Curriculum Division, Edgar Dale, 202–204

Dale, Edgar, Curriculum Division, 202–204

Davis, Jerome, *Character Assassination* (R), (Mary Bradbury), 48–49

Dennis, Wayne, *et al.*, *Current Trends in the Relation of Psychology to Medicine* (R), (Dwight M. Palmer), 111

Deschin, Celia S., Child Welfare 1950, 1–12

Division of Appointments, John O. Niederhauser, 199–201

Dolch, Edward William, *Teaching Primary Reading* (R), (Esther Schatz), 244

E[CKELBERRY], R. H., Editorial Comment, 22–23; 45–47; 74–75, 84; 105–106, 111–12; 133, 140; 160–61, 168; 195–96, 238–42, 246
ECKELBERRY, R. H., Editorial Division, 204–205
Editorial Comment, 22–23, 28; 45–47; 74–75, 84; 105–106, 111–12; 133, 140; 160–61, 168; 195–96, 238–42, 246
Editorial Division, R. H. Eckelberry, 204–205
Educational Policies Commission, *Point Four and Education* (R), (H. Gordon Hullfish), 107
Eisenstein, Miriam, *Jewish Schools in Poland, 1919–1939* (R), (Lloyd D. Williams), 53–54
Era of the Educational Engineer, The, W. W. Charters, 230–37, 246
ELIASSEN, R. H., and ANDERSON, EARL W., Investigations in Teacher Supply and Demand Reported in 1950, 97–104, 112
Evaluation Division, W. R. Flesher, 205–208

Farnsworth, Paul Randolph, *Musical Taste: Its Measurement and Cultural Nature* (R), (Joseph A. Leeder), 167
Fink, T. Ross, and Cardwell, Jesse F., *A Report to the President of George Peabody College for Teachers on the Student-Teaching Program* (R), (William Logan), 83
FLESHER, W. R., Evaluation Division, 205–208
FLESHER, W. R., and HOLMES, DARRELL, A Note on the Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness, 29–33, 56
FOSTER, CLARKE L., Some Thoughts concerning Book Reviewing, 64–66
Fowlkes, John Guy, and Morgan, Donald A., editors, *Elementary Teachers Guide to Free Curriculum Materials* (R), (Ruth E. Seeger), 52
Frizzle, Arnold Luther, *A Study of Some of the Influences of Regents Requirements and Examinations in French* (R), (James B. Tharp), 163–64
Froehlich, Clifford P., *Guidance Services in Smaller Schools* (R), (Collins W. Burnett), 138

Gregg, Russell T., editor, *Planning Modern School Buildings* (R), (Franklin J. Gottfried), 54

Hamilton, Kenneth W., *Counseling the Handicapped in the Rehabilitation Process* (R), (Martha E. Jackson), 135
HARDING, LOWRY W., A Note to Student Teachers on the Supervision and Evaluation of Their Work, 57–63
Harding, Lowry W.; Burr, James B.; and Jacobs, Leland B., *Student Teaching in the Elementary School* (R), (Charles W. Young), 50–51
Heiss, Elwood D.; Obourn, Ellsworth S.; and Hoffman, Charles W., *Modern Science Teaching* (R), (John S. Richardson), 108
HERRICK, JOHN H., Survey Division, 211–13
Hoffman, Charles W.; Heiss, Elwood D.; and Obourn, Ellsworth S., *Modern Science Teaching* (R), (John S. Richardson), 108
HOLMES, DARRELL, and FLESHER, W. R., A Note on the Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness, 29–33, 56
HOLY, T. C., Certain Procedures Used in the Oregon School Legislative Program, 125–29
HOLY, T. C., Program of the Bureau of Educational Research, 197–99
HOLY, T. C., Some Contributions of School Surveys in Ohio, 179–89
HULLFISH, H. GORDON, The Profession and the Public Face a Common Problem, 113–16

Institute for Education by Radio-Television, I. Keith Tyler, 219–20
Investigations in Teacher Supply and Demand Reported in 1950, R. H. Eliassen and Earl W. Anderson, 97–104, 112

Jacobs, Leland B.; Burr, James B.; and Harding, Lowry W., *Student Teaching in the Elementary School* (R), (Charles W. Young), 50–51
JONES, VERNON, *Character and Citizenship Education: a Syllabus for Use in Teacher Training* (R), (L. O. Andrews), 243

KAHO, ELIZABETH E., *Analysis of the Study of Music Literature in Selected American Colleges* (R), (Joseph A. Leeder), 245
Kandel, I. L., *The Impact of the War upon American Education* (R), (H. Gordon Hullfish), 82–83

Leadership on the College Campus, Collins W. Burnett, 34–41
LEGGETT, H. W., *Bertrand Russell: a Sketch of His Life and Work* (R), (Louise Edmondson), 245
Letters to the Editor, 47, 56
Liddell, Helen; Vermeil, Edmond; and Suchodolski, Bogdan, *Education in Occupied Germany* (R), (Walter L. Dorn), 24–25
List of Common Words for First Grade, A, Josephine H. MacLatchy and Frances R. Wardwell, 151–59

Los Angeles Division of Research and Guidance of the Office of the County Superintendent of Schools, "Guidance Handbook for Elementary Schools" and "Guidance Handbook for Secondary Schools" (R), (Mary J. Drucker), 107–108

M[acLatchy], J. H., Editorial Comment, 23, 28

MacLatchy, Josephine H., The College of Education Work Conference, 129–32, 139–40

MacLatchy, Josephine H., and Wardwell, Frances R., A List of Common Words for First Grade, 151–59

Michigan State College Board of Examiners, *Comprehensive Examinations in a Program of General Education* (R), (John V. McQuitty), 167–68

Mooney, Ross L., Personnel Division, 208–10

Mooney, Ross L., Problems in the Development of Research Men, 141–50

Morgan, Donald A., and Fowlkes, John Guy, editors, *Elementary Teachers Guide to Free Curriculum Materials* (R), (Ruth E. Seeger), 52

National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, *Educational Leaders: Their Function and Preparation* (R), (Max R. Goodson), 26

Niederhauser, John O., Division of Appointments, 199–201

Niederhauser, John O.; Partington, Elisabeth; and Vesey, Margaret A., Teaching Opportunities in 1950, 85–96

Nixon, Alfred F., *Teaching Biology for Appreciation* (R), (John S. Richardson), 83–84

Norvell, George W., *The Reading Interests of Young People* (R), (Leland B. Jacobs), 136–37

Note on the Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness, A, W. R. Flesher and Darrell Holmes, 29–33, 56

Note to Student Teachers on the Supervision and Evaluation of Their Work, A, Lowry W. Harding, 57–63

Oakes, Mervin E., *Children's Explanations of Natural Phenomena* (R), (Robert E. Hubbard), 55

Obourn, Ellsworth S.; Heiss, Elwood D.; and Hoffman, Charles W., *Modern Science Teaching* (R), (John S. Richardson), 108

O'Brien, Mae, *Children's Reactions to Radio Adaptations of Juvenile Books* (R), (Catherine Williams), 165–66

Ohio School of the Air, Margaret C. Tyler, 216–18

Orme, Rhoda, *Counseling in Residence Halls* (R), (Christine Y. Conaway), 138–39

Partington, Elisabeth; Niederhauser, John O.; and Vesey, Margaret A., Teaching Opportunities in 1950, 85–96

Personnel Division, Ross L. Mooney, 208–10

Problems in the Development of Research Men, Ross L. Mooney, 141–50

Profession and the Public Face a Common Problem, The, H. Gordon Hullfish, 113–16

Program of the Bureau of Educational Research, T. C. Holy, 197–99

Readings, 24–28, 48–55, 76–84, 107–11, 134–39, 162–68, 243–45

Reeder, Ward G., *A First Course in Education* (R), (R. L. Morton), 77–78

Reference Division, Ruth Seeger, 210–11

Ritter, E. L., and Shepherd, L. A., *Methods of Teaching in Town and Rural Schools* (R), (Leland B. Jacobs), 81

Robbins, G. D., A Survey of Certain Aspects of Curriculum Organization, 41–44, 56

Robinson, Francis P., *Principles and Procedures in Student Counseling* (R), (Joseph Axelrod), 162–63

Roens, Bert A., and Rothney, John W. M., *Guidance of American Youth: an Experimental Study* (R), (Mary J. Drucker), 80

Rothney, John W. M., and Roens, Bert A., *Guidance of American Youth: an Experimental Study* (R), (Mary J. Drucker), 80

"Rugg Incident," The (E), R. H. Eckelberry, 238–42, 246

Ruggles, Alice McGuffey, *The Story of the McGuffeys* (R), (Clarke L. Foster), 135–36

Schlick, Moritz, *Philosophy of Nature* (R), (Albert E. Avey), 26–27

School Survey and Its Social Implications, The, Walter D. Cocking, 160–78, 196

School Survey Appraised by the Superintendent, A, Walter S. Crewson, 190–94

Seeger, Ruth, Reference Division, 210–11

Seeley, R. S. K., *The Function of the University* (R), (H. Gordon Hullfish), 48

Shepherd, L. A., and Ritter, E. L., *Methods of Teaching in Town and Rural Schools* (R), (Leland B. Jacobs), 81

Some Contributions of School Surveys in Ohio, T. C. Holy, 179–89

Some Thoughts concerning Book Reviewing, Clarke L. Foster, 64–66

SPAULDING, SETH, Two Formulas for Estimating the Reading Difficulty of Spanish, 117–24
Staff Publications, 220–24
Statement by the Faculty, College of Education, The Ohio State University, A, 225–30
Stewart, W. F., *Methods of Good Teaching* (R), (Henry S. Brunner), 52–53
Survey Division, John H. Herrick, 211–13
Survey of Certain Aspects of Curriculum Organization, A, G. D. Robbins, 41–44, 56

Teacher's Report to Her Superintendent, A, Elizabeth Tolbert, 13–21
Teaching Aids Laboratory, Norman Woelfel, 213–16
Teaching Opportunities in 1950, John O. Niederhauser, Elisabeth Partington, and Margaret A. Vesey, 85–96
Thomas, John Wesley, *James Freeman Clarke: Apostle of German Culture to America* (R), (Lloyd P. Williams), 137
Tireman, L. S., *Teaching Spanish-Speaking Children* (R), (James B. Tharp), 79–80
Tireman, L. S., and Watson, Mary, *A Community School in a Spanish-Speaking Village* (R), (James B. Tharp), 79
TOLBERT, ELIZABETH, A Teacher's Report to Her Superintendent, 13–21
Traxler, Arthur E., editor, *Goals of American Education* (R), (Leland B. Jacobs), 134
Two Formulas for Estimating the Reading Difficulty of Spanish, Seth Spaulding, 117–24
TYLER, I. KEITH, Institute for Education by Radio-Television, 219–20
TYLER, MARGARET C., Ohio School of the Air, 216–18

Unesco, *The Use of Mobile Cinema and Radio Vans in Fundamental Education* (R), (Hubert Morehead), 244–45
Unesco and the International Bureau of Education, Joint Publications Nos. 121 (*Introduction to Mathematics in Primary Schools*), 123 (*The Teaching of Handicrafts in Secondary Schools*), 127 (*XIIIth International Conference on Public Education*), 117 (*Primary Teacher Training*), 125 (*International Conference on Public Education: Collected Recommendations, 1934–1950*), (R), (Clarke L. Foster), 164–65; 166–67

Valentine, P. F., editor, *The American College* (R), (Mary Bradbury), 27–28
Validating Campus Leadership, Collins W. Burnett, 67–73, 84
Van Til, William, *et al., Democracy Demands It* (R), (Robert E. Jewett), 53
Vermeil, Edmond; Hahn, K. J.; and Le Bras, Gabriel, *The Churches in Germany* (R), (Walter L. Dorn), 24–25
VESEY, MARGARET A.; NEIDERHAUSER, JOHN O.; and PARTINGTON, ELISABETH, Teaching Opportunities in 1950, 85–96

WARDWELL, FRANCES R., and MACLATCHY, JOSEPHINE H., A List of Common Words for First Grade, 151–59
Warters, Jane, *Achieving Maturity* (R), (Emily L. Stogdill), 81–82
Watson, Mary, and Tireman, L. S., *A Community School in a Spanish-Speaking Village* (R), (James B. Tharp), 79
Williams, J. Grenfell, *Radio in Fundamental Education in Undeveloped Areas* (R), (Hubert Morehead), 165
Williamson, E. G., *Counseling Adolescents* (R), (Frank M. Fletcher, Jr.), 76
Wilson, Pauline Park, *College Women Who Express Futility* (R), (Kathryn N. Hopwood), 138
WOELFEL, NORMAN, Teaching Aids Laboratory, 213–16

ZANGWELL, O. L., *An Introduction to Modern Psychology* (R), (L. O. Andrews), 243